THE

WINES OF THE BIBLE.

BY

REV. C. H. FOWLER, D.D.

NEW YORK:
National Temperance Society and Publication House,
58 READE STREET.
1878.

Copyright,
J. N. STEARNS, Publishing Agent,
1878.

THE WINES OF THE BIBLE.

THE remarkable utterances of an eminent Christian gentleman and divine, reported in the daily papers about ten days ago, determine the direction of the argument which I propose to project.

The city and the country are watching with intense interest a struggle between the Police and Excise Boards and our city authorities. Much of this interest depends upon the wide-spread conviction that this surface contest is only an incident in the strife; that the real struggle is carried on in the fathomless depths of the great sea of darkness called "New York politics." However that may be, there is enough of this surface conflict to engross our best thought. The principles involved are as old as God and as certain as His Word.

The Excise struggle in itself is the thing of a day. I do not mean to belittle it. I would not weaken the hands that are drawing the long bow against the great enemy of society and of mankind as he takes form in this strife. To every true word spoken for the support of the Commissioners in the enforcement of the law, I gladly say "Amen." Let no one of the other party say that temperance men are seeking to weaken each other. Nothing can be further from the truth. Those of us who go to the utmost limit of human in-

fluence and human agency to circumscribe, correct, put down, quarantine, and ultimately, if possible, annihilate this mother of all crime, go all the way with the men who circumscribe their endeavors by efforts merely to enforce the Excise law. We go further; that is all; and if they can not see their way to go up to the limit of my convictions, I simply say, "God bless them in the work they are trying to do." We do not all go the same distance, but we all go the same way.

After saying this much, I will repeat that this Excise struggle is the matter of a day. The interest in it must be temporary. But the great cause it may be made to help is the cause of all the ages.

The foundation of this Temperance cause must be found in the Bible. If God is not interested in its success, then it can not permanently succeed. We are content to accept Him as our guide, and take His Word as the standard of duty. Any words that represent the Bible as on the side of liquor-drinkers involve consequences infinitely wider and more enduring than the temporary party triumphs concerning the Excise law. If it be true that the Bible actually advocates the liquor-drinking of our day, then this fact must outweigh every other element in this controversy. For the Bible will stand, and its principles will outwear the stars. If it be true that Christ committed His kingdom to the sea of modern liquor-drinking, then that sea shall never be dried up; for Christ's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. If it be true that "no ancient or modern ever wrote or spoke of wine without meaning fermented wine," then the principles that underlie this conflict must be squared with that truth; and the issue before us rises into infinite proportions.

It frequently happens that enthusiastic reformers find wholesale criticism upon the Church of Christ their cheapest and most marketable stock. We are accustomed to hear ministers and members exhorted to improved zeal in its cause. But we regard such exhortations more popular than appropriate. It is like the spark thrown up by the breath of the blast-furnace that, expiring in mid-air, exhorts the furnace to increase its temperature. The Church is the source of all power on this subject. The Church of Christ is the greatest temperance society ever launched upon the sea of the centuries. We object to most of the special pleading on this subject. But the speech of ten days ago, as reported, gives an occasion for such exhortation, and if accepted as the voice of Christianity, would rebuke our confidence in the presence of the adversaries. We will not speak for the Churches; one man can hardly do that. One swallow does not make a summer. We will let the Churches speak for themselves.

This evil is, doubtless, without a peer in all human society. A man who is much honored in this city, WILLARD PARKER, said in an address to the American Association for the Cure of Inebriates, "Alcohol is a poison." He also said that for the thirty-eight years preceding his statement, which was given some little time ago, over one hundred thousand people had been carried to their graves in this single city of New York by intoxicating drinks, either taken themselves or taken by their parents. This is only one city. What about all cities and about all lands? The State Board of Public Charities in the State of Massachusetts make this significant statement: that in the careful breeding of cattle 96 per cent. come to maturity, and that of horses 95

per cent. come to maturity even in this northern climate; but in the breeding of children less than 65 per cent. come to maturity. It must be that there is a Herod in every grog-shop. Look at the proportions of this evil, for we need to see exactly who it is we are endorsing. The reports in reference to the use of liquor give these round numbers. (I will give simply the millions, and that is a curious statement that they are so vast that a man can not stop to think of anything less than a million about it). Seventy-one millions of gallons of distilled liquors in a single year; three hundred and eighty-three millions of beer, and a vast amount of imported liquors. Now these are the reports on which men pay taxes, and they never lie against themselves. You may make your own estimates. It takes a very full drinker to consume a gallon of whisky in fifty drinks, allowing ten cents a drink for his whisky; and it is a pretty large drinker of beer that consumes a gallon in twenty-four drinks, allowing five cents a glass for the beer; and then put down the imported liquors at the figure given, one hundred and sixty-four millions, we have as a result paid out in money year by year, actually paid over the counters for this commodity, eight hundred and sixty-three millions.

Make your own estimates. This is merely a matter of what we pay for the liquor—more than one-third of our entire national debt. There are some little incidental items that ought to come into this calculation. For instance, in the last hundred years, by a very moderate calculation, we have sunk ten billions of property. It is gone; we are out that much as a nation. Now then, we must charge up to this account the interest on this ten billions, and if you will put that at seven per cent. there is seven

hundred millions of dollars to be added to this other eight hundred millions. Now take the time of the men who manufacture, and the men who sell, and the men who drink, and by a careful calculation those figures can not be reduced to less than four hundred and forty millions. Take the interest on the capital used in the manufacture of liquor, twenty-five millions more; the interest on the capital used in connection with saloons, thirty-six millions more; money given to the poor in private charities, ten millions more. Then the trials of criminals, the fees of judges and lawyers, and the salaries of sheriffs, and all these, all over the land, give us two hundred and seven millions more. Put down the losses by sea and on land fifty millions more—and I want to say that each one of these estimates is a long way inside the facts—and we have as a resultant two billions, three hundred and forty-four millions—more than our national debt. You can not comprehend it. If you will pass the Silver Bill, and put one of these vigorous young men on the sidewalk with a shovel to shovel out silver to pay the interest on this annual loss, he can not stand the wear; he can not shovel out as fast as the interest comes due. This gives a little outside look at the great enemy we are called to confront.

Let me give you for a moment an inside look. Here is a young man, gentle, cultured, with his nerves on the surface and his heart in his hand and his soul in his eye, pushes within the reach of this great charmer. It may be in your house on New Year's day he takes his first taste. He finds that that did not kill him; he tries it again; he is pressed with work; he drinks to strengthen himself, and soon the old story is repeated over in his case—friendless

homeless, ragged, blear-eyed, bloated, oozing, staggering, creaking in every joint, covered with filth, making his way down to death. That is one process. There is an army of nearly two millions of cases like this. Nearly one hundred thousand annually drop into a drunkard's grave. But that is not all. Go to that home; what is the process there? The wife is as gentle as any woman in the land, trained with the utmost care, never has known what it is to feel the pressure of any need, goes out into that home; soon she finds that there is a shadow by the door. She shudders; she is anxious. Late hours when the husband comes home alarm her; she smells his breath; she misses the accustomed luxuries; ornaments cease to come in, the old ornaments by and by move out; the spoons are sold and gone; the forks follow; one article after another vanishes; the Bible goes, the fence is broken down, the windows are broken out, the gate falls off, the sidewalk is torn up—it is shabby and wretched; then somebody else wants even this house, and the one in the alley is cheaper, and they move into the alley. Now go in. No furniture but a bench; no fire, and it is winter, and the children are huddled together trying to keep warm. The father comes in only half drunk, mad for more liquor; abuses the woman he had sworn to protect; the children cower in the corner, and the last words they hear are the oaths of their father, and the last sight they see is the pale and patient face of the mother. Her friends have left her long ago, lost sight of her; she has dropped out of social life; she has almost forgotten the girls she knew when she was a girl; there she is! In the morning the father is gone, and the children see her cold face clotted with her blood. That is the work of this monster.

You may take any one of the great army of haggard women that groan and stagger on without hope under the load of shame and in the grip of perpetual want; or any one of the great multitude of children, worse than orphans, inheriting a bondage of disease and corruption, bred in alleys, dandled in the lap of sin, trained to crime, and doomed to ignorance and infamy; you may take any one of these human tatters, torn loose from all social restraints and left to flutter in the gales of passion and burn in the fires of delirium, and I will stake this case for the condemnation of this hoary, infinite evil at the bar of eternal justice upon a single sigh or sob from any one of this great host of victims. If sentence against this monster was not instantaneous and overwhelming in the light of human thought, the good Christ would be shut up to open and almighty war for the capture and purification of the eternal throne. It is not thinkable that God can either approve these crimes or stand idly by in this great conflict.

We stand to-day on vantage ground gained by centuries of hard encounter. The past is full of strange views and utterances on this subject, and the present is full of promise for the speedy coming of right convictions and of consequent deliverance.

It is in this one hundred years that bills for liquor made a marked feature of an Association of ministers. A dedication or an installation was a high day and sometimes rivaled election days for drunkenness. One town of Connecticut forbade the game of shuffle-board in houses of entertainment, because "much precious time is spent unfruitfully and *much waste of wine and beer occasioned.*" Less than one hundred years ago, Litchfield, Massachusetts, became aroused on Temperance and organized a society whose members agreed "*not to drink more than was good for*

them." One church in Illinois, as a Temperance movement, ordered that no member should be allowed more than forty gallons of whisky a year for each member of his family. We are on the march up to victory. Now the great denominations are outspoken on this subject. Total abstinence is the rule—drinking is the exception.

With this marked advance in views keeping step always with available light, we are prepared to expect improved exegesis of the Scripture-teachings on this subject. While the Book remains the same, and is infallible, the human interpretations of it improve with the passing generations. We have the same heavens, in which the unaided eye discovers only a thousand orbs; but better lenses and helps have been found, till the heavens are studded with orbs by the thousand million. So in this wonderful Book; we have not less, but more truth.

It is still in the memory of men when the Bible was supposed to teach the recent creation of the earth; to justify arbitrary and irresponsible government, as in human slavery to uphold the piety and purity of polygamy, and modern history is illumined by fagots that were kindled to guide the erring feet of heretics back into the way of righteousness. We have risen out of these hideous convictions, not by any change in the Book of God, but by better light, better glasses, better interpretation.

Take the history of the development of our present ideas on this subject.*

In 1826 the Temperance movement was organized

* Taken substantially from an essay of Rev. D. C. Babcock read before a meeting of the Methodist preachers of Philadelphia, December 17, 1877.

on the basis of "abstinence from ardent spirits or distilled liquors." This was based upon the general conviction that "alcohol was the product of distillation." Even good scholars believed that it was a result of distillation, and that fermented liquors were, therefore, harmless and helpful. The continued intemperance of many abstainers from ardent spirits turned attention to the instruction of science on this point. This revealed the fact that alcohol was the product of vinous fermentation, and that the distillery could educe it only from fermented liquors. It also appeared that alcohol is the same thing in all its combinations from beer to brandy. This discovery advanced the principle to total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors.

This step met more foes and fallacies than any other movement in the entire history. The first National Temperance Convention, held in 1833 in Philadelphia, refused to act on the subject. In 1836 the next National Temperance Convention, held in Saratoga, after long and careful study and discussion of the question, advanced almost unanimously to the total abstinence ground.

This advance was opposed by what has long been familiar as the Bible argument. It is most astonishing how familiar drunkards are with this old argument. It comprises nearly all they know about the Bible. It is also amazing how some good men labor to make the Bible excuse and defend drinking. The statements were: That the Bible favored the use of wine, called it a blessing; Jesus made it miraculously, drank it constantly, ordained and commanded its use perpetually; that excess is all that the Bible condemns. All these arguments will sound familiar to you in these last few days. All Christendom held to

these views. But science opened the eyes of the world, and scholars who feared God and loved His truth went about a critical examination of the texts of Scripture supposed to favor drinking.

This search stumbled upon some strange statements. On the surface God seemed frequently to contradict Himself. Here we are exhorted to "buy wine and milk;" there we are told that "wine is a mocker." Here, "wine cheereth God and man;" there, it "biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." Here it says, "God give thee plenty of corn and wine;" there, "look not thou upon the wine when it is red."

It is the first law of interpretation to grant that an author is not a fool. If there is any way to make common-sense out of his statements, that interpretation must be accepted. This law drove good and wise men to study of the words back of our English translation. The necessity of this can not be doubted. Language is full of illustrations of how words change their meanings in the lapse of centuries. The old word in the *Common Prayer-book*, Lord "prevent" us, means that we should not be prevented, but gone before, and so helped. In the days of our fathers all farmers and laborers were "*villains*," a term which has gone down in the order of virtue. These simple examples show the absolute necessity of going back to the languages of the Bible, and to the ideas and experiences of Bible-days to be sure of a correct understanding of the Book.

The assumptions of the men who try to defend the idea that the Bible teaches the use of intoxicating wine make this investigation more necessary. They say that a word in the lips of Noah and of David and of Jesus must mean exactly the same thing; and that

every word must have but one meaning, and always mean that same thing; that the words used have no general meaning that might cover a variety of objects or ideas. "Wine" is used for intoxicating or fermented liquors. All concede this. The alcoholic men insist that it is never used for anything else. This is the question of fact to be tested. It is affirmed that "no ancient or modern ever wrote or spoke of wine without meaning fermented wine."

It seems incredible that any man should make such statements, but nothing less bold will meet the emergencies of the case If Christ is to be held as an advocate for wine-drinking in any sense to make it serve the cause of modern drinking—and that is the drinking in hand for which it is used—then this new law of interpretation must be enforced.

Jesus Christ is put on trial as a drinking man; for the alcoholic view of wine makes it necessary to say that Jesus is on the side of wine-drinkers. It puts Him on trial again, not for His life, but for infinitely more than life, for honor, and virtue, and integrity, and character, and for all that is of value in His religion.

In this trial of Jesus Christ there must be some false witnesses, just as there was when He stood before that old high-priest in that other city in that old century. I do not for one moment imagine, or pretend to imagine, that the eminent Christian philanthropist and divine who says that "no ancient or modern ever wrote or spoke of wine without meaning fermented wine," that the idea of two or more kinds of wine is "preposterous," and that "sensible people are disgusted with it, and fall back upon the argument of ex-

pediency;" I do not say that he would intentionally say one word to dishonor his Master; but I do say, that the logic of his position, by which Jesus is made to defend modern drinking, involves the Son of God in a course of conduct that, as a matter of fact, overwhelms in the blackest ruin more men than all other forms of sin known to the civilized nations, and that, too, when there is no appreciable good to be gained, and no accessible defense for such a course.

The argument upon which these revolting conclusions rest is stated by its friends in these words: "Noah got drunk with wine; therefore, wine must, in every other text, mean a fermented liquor" "The word wine is applied in the Bible to an intoxicating liquor; therefore it must *always* necessarily mean an intoxicating liquor."

The argument is as weak as its consequences are revolting; but nothing short of this forced interpretion will prove that Jesus drank intoxicating liquors, and nothing short of this will make an excuse for making Him the enemy of modern temperance men, and the boon companion of modern drinkers. If wine on the lips or in the hand of Jesus may mean anything else than that particular liquor against which the Holy Ghost cried out in the ancient Church, "Look not upon the wine when it is red," then the word and act of Jesus may not prove the case, and will not serve the cause of wine-drinking. Jesus is on trial, charged with drinking fermented and intoxicating liquor, and charged with contradicting Himself point-blank, so as to im-

peach His integrity, namely, in saying, "Look not upon the wine when it is red," and yet in commanding His disciples all to drink of it. He is charged with immorality in saying that wine "is good," and that it is "a mocker." Now then, it is a law of evidence, obtaining in every civilized country under the stars, and justified in every mind under the sun, that whenever the theory of innocence will explain the facts of a case as satisfactorily as the theory of guilt, then the facts prove nothing. To make the argument against Jesus good, it must be proven that the word wine, as used in the Bible, always means an intoxicating liquor. Otherwise, we are victimized by the fallacy of undistributed muddle. This is the argument: Jesus drank wine; modern drinkers drink wine; therefore, Jesus is, or is like, a modern drinker. The old parallel shows the fallacy: Man is an animal; a horse is an animal; therefore, a man is a horse.

Whence came this fermented liquor? The laws of fermentation are laws of nature, and work always under the same circumstances.

1. There must be saccharine matter and gluten, or yeast.

2. The temperature must not be below 50° nor above 75° Fahrenheit. Under 50° it does not ferment, over 75° it turns to vinegar by a first and direct fermentation.

3. It must not be too thick, like syrup. It must be of the proper consistency.

Experience demonstrates that grape-juice never undergoes vinous fermentation in the grape. Science says that this is prevented by the absence of two conditions:

1. The gluten or yeast is deposited in separate sacs, or cells, and so kept from the saccharine matter.

2. The saccharine matter is kept from the oxygen of the atmosphere, which is needed to change the saccharine matter before it can set up the process of vinous fermentation. Grapes rot on the vine, but do not turn to alcohol. Nature never produces alcohol.

It is also matter of experience that a warm climate produces sweet fruits; a cold season gives us sour fruits. The change is manifest.

Palestine is a hot climate. During the season for gathering the grapes the temperature is seldom as low as 100°. Nature provides for souring and decaying the grapes, but does not provide for vinous fermentation, which is impossible at a temperature above 75°.

Were the Jews and ancients acquainted with any process for preserving the juice of the grape, the unfermented wine? They used various processes to secure this result:

1. They excluded the air from the sweet wine.

2. They boiled down the juice to the consistency of syrup.

3. They filtered it, and so broke its power by removing its gluten.

4. They kept it cool and excluded from the air till the gluten subsided, then drew off the wine, which was safe from fermentation.

5. They also used sulphur to neutralize the yeast or gluten.

Proof is overwhelming that they did use these modes of preserving the unfermented wines.

Archbishop Potter (A.D. 1674) says: "The Lacedemonians used to boil their wines, and not drink them till they were four years old. They called the boiled juice of the grape, wine." Aristotle (B.C. 384): "The

wine of Arcadia was so thick that it was necessary to scrape it from the skin bottles in which it was contained, and to dissolve the scrapings in water." Columella, contemporary with the apostles, says that in Italy and Greece it was common to boil the wines. Pliny speaks of wine in his day, two centuries old, that had the consistency of honey. The Mishna states that "the Jews were in the habit of using boiled wine." Horace says: "There is no wine sweeter to drink than Lesbian; that it was like nectar and perfectly harmless, and would not produce intoxication." This evidence might be extended for hours. They not only preserved the wine unfermented, but even the grapes.

Josephus mentions the fortress of Masada in Palestine, built by Herod. He says: "Here was laid up corn in large quantities; here was also wine and oil in abundance, with all kinds of pulse and dates heaped together. These fruits were also fresh and full ripe, and no way inferior to such fruits newly laid in, although they were little short of a hundred years from the laying in of these provisions."

Pliny confirms these statements about preserving fruits. Swinburne says, that in Spain they preserve grapes sound from year to year. Dr. Thomson says: "The Moslems make no fermented wines; they boil the juice down to preserve it, and they claim to have received this custom from the remotest antiquity."

The evidence concerning this unfermented wine touches another important point. This unfermented wine was held in very high repute among the ancients. Horace, you remember, says: "There is no wine sweeter to drink than Lesbian; like nectar; will not produce intoxication." Plutarch says: 'Wine is rendered old or feeble in strength when it

is frequently filtered. The strength or spirit being thus excluded, the wine neither inflames the brain nor infests the mind and the passions, and is much more pleasant to drink." Pliny says: "The most useful wine has all its force or strength broken by the filter." Horace again says: "The filter renders the wine lighter, sweeter, and more pleasant to drink." Pliny, Columella, Varo, and Cato were in high social life, and they gave minute attention to the preservation of unfermented wines.

Prof. Moses Stuart says: "Facts show that the ancients not only preserved their wine unfermented, but regarded it as of a higher flavor and finer quality than fermented wine."

Dr. Jacobus says: "All who know of the wines then used well understand the unfermented juice of the grape. The purest wine of Jerusalem and Lebanon, as we tasted them, were commonly boiled and sweet, without intoxicating qualities such as we here get in liquors called wines. The boiling prevents fermentation. Those were esteemed the best wines which were least strong."

In the presence of these facts, in this ancient atmosphere, we can approach the use of these words in the Bible with a better chance to understand their true import, than we could from our modern habits of alcohol-drinking.

This question requires for its prosecution only a knowledge of Hebrew and of Greek, with patient investigation. There are nine Hebrew words and four Greek words that are translated by our English word *wine*. This simple fact settles the controversy, unless all these thirteen words are used in exactly the same sense wherever they occur in the Scriptures.

Yayin occurs one hundred and forty-one times in

the Bible, and has a great variety of meanings. "It stingeth like an adder, and biteth like a serpent." In Deut. xxviii. 39, *yayin* means something to be gathered by men or eaten by worms. In Isaiah xvi. 10, it is grapes to be trodden in the vat.

Professor Moses Stuart says: "*Yayin* is a generic word to designate such drinks as may be of an intoxicating nature when fermented, and which are not so before fermentation. It designates *grape-juice*, or the liquid which the fruit of the vine yields. It may be new or old, sweet or sour, fermented or unfermented, intoxicating or unintoxicating."

President E. Nott and Professor Tayler Lewis affirm that "*yayin* is *often* restricted to the fruit of the vine in its natural or unintoxicating state." These are high authorities. Kitto says: "It is a very general term, including every species of wine." "Come, buy wine (*yayin*) and milk without money and without price." Isa. lv. 1. *Yayin* appears in the Septuagint and New Testament in the word *oinos*. This is generic, like *yayin*.

Another word often used in the Bible is *tirosh*. It is used thirty-eight times, as follows: in connection with corn and fruit, nineteen times; with corn alone, eleven times; with the vine, three times; and otherwise, five times. It is rendered in our English Bible by *wine*, twenty-six times; *new wine*, eleven times; and once by *sweet wine*.

The children of Israel were commanded to bring the firstfruit of all manner of trees, of wine (*tirosh*), and of oil. "The tithes of corn and of the new wine (*tirosh*)." But in Levit. ii. 11, they were strictly forbidden to offer any *leaven*, yeast, or ferment. Isaac blessed Jacob, saying: "Therefore God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and

plenty of corn and wine." It is not thinkable that this is the wine that mocketh and stingeth and biteth. God says to Israel: "I will give you the rain of your land in due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine (*tirosh*), and thine oil." Deut. xi. 14. Again: "That he may bring forth food out of the earth, and wine (*yayin*), that maketh glad the heart of man." Ps. xiv. 14, 15. Also in Judges ix. 13: "Should I leave my wine (*tirosh*), which cheereth the heart of God and man?" "Buy wine (*yayin*) and milk without money and without price." Isa. lv. 1. "Come eat of my bread and drink of the wine (*yayin*) I have mingled." Cant. v. 1: "I have drunk my wine (*yayin*) with my milk: eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved."

Let us not lose sight of this great distinction that runs throughout the Bible. God seems to exhaust the force of language in denouncing wine which "moveth itself aright;" which is a "mocker," and "raging;" "which biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." He says of it, "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink." He calls it the "wine of astonishment," the wine through which "the priest and the prophet have erred," and "are out of the way;" through which they "err in vision and stumble in judgment;" through which "all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean." He calls it "the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps." Surely this can not be the wine which we are asked "to buy without money and without price," which we are urged to "drink abundantly," and is held up before the eyes of the Israelites as the supreme promise and blessing of God; and which Jesus made for His friends at the

wedding-feast; and consecrated in His perpetual memorial, in the very oath of allegiance by which He strengthens His subjects and saints through all ages. We submit that this distinction is as wide as the impassable gulf between Dives and Abraham. The obliteration of this distinction impeaches the common-sense of the great authors of antiquity and of the great scholars of modern times; the inspiration of prophets and apostles; the consistency of revelation itself; the purity of the very Son of God; and the authority of God himself.

In the presence of these facts, and of this broad distinction, we are not surprised to find the great modern exegetists testifying for the acquittal of Jesus from the charge of drinking intoxicating liquors. Mr. Delavan called upon Professor George Bush, stated his views on this subject, and asked an opinion. Prof. Bush promptly said, "You are wrong." Referring to a text, he said, "This verse upsets your theory." When asked to examine the original he did so, and with amazement said: "No permission to drink intoxicating wine here. I do not care about wine, and it is very seldom that I taste it, but I have felt until now at liberty to drink in moderation from this verse." After careful examination, he said to Mr. Delavan at a subsequent interview: "You have the whole ground, and in time the whole Christian world will be obliged to adopt your views." President E. Nott, of Union College, says: "That unintoxicating wines existed from remote antiquity, and were held in high estimation by the wise and good, there can be no reasonable doubt. The evidence is unequivocal and plenary."

Professor Moses Stuart says: "My final conclusion is this, namely, that whenever the Scriptures speak

of wine as a comfort, a blessing, or a libation to God, and rank it with such articles as corn and oil, they mean—they can mean—only such wine as contained no alcohol that could have a mischievous tendency; that wherein they denounce it, prohibit it, and connect it with drunkenness and reveling, they can mean only alcoholic or intoxicating wine."

Dr. Barnes says: "The wine of Judea was a pure juice of the grape without any mixture of alcohol, and commonly weak and harmless. It was the common drink of the people, and did not tend to produce intoxication."

If evidence is good for anything, we submit that it can not be doubted that the Bible speaks of two kinds of wine, one of which was unfermented and harmless. We also submit that the statement, that "no ancient or modern ever wrote or spoke of wine without meaning fermented wine," is out of harmony with the facts in the case. With the severing of this link in the argument, the impeachment of Jesus falls unsustained, and the release of Barabbas is reversed.

Another step in this biblical argument is what Horace Bushnell would call *the rescue of lost passages.* Some Scriptures have been captured by prejudice and taken into the mills of the heathen, and made to drive the distilleries and turn the wheels of destruction. It will not be difficult to rescue them in the light of present facts, and give them the opportunity to do the will of their Author and Master.

The miracle of Cana of Galilee is claimed as proof that Jesus favored wine-drinking at feasts. It is claimed that Jesus made about sixty gallons for His friends of that which He had denounced as a mocker and as the poison of asps. While He cried against it

as "biting like a serpent and stinging like an adder," He makes this mocker as His benediction. This is supported by the statement that the ruler of the feast called it the best wine. This loses its force in the fact that the highest ancient authorities, as we have seen, called the unfermented wine the best. Jesus, by whom all things consist, every summer transformed the dew of heaven and the moisture of the earth by the slow processes of growth and life into the juice of the grape. Now, by a superhuman work, He condenses that work into a few seconds of time. This miracle involves Jesus in modern wine-drinking no more than His constant creation of the juice of the grape. The demands of the generic terms and of the customs of the times are all satisfied by the theory of innocence as well as by the theory of guilt. Thus, then, are left the infinite weight of His character and the absolute authority of His command, "Look not upon the wine when it is red," as reasons for acquitting Him of the charge of making intoxicating fermented wine, which He never made anywhere else in the universe. Such wine as Jesus made will never do any harm.

Another lost passage is that about putting "new wine in old bottles." It is claimed that it is put into new bottles because the bottles will stretch and not break. This is a misapprehension. The power of fermenting wine would explode the toughest skins. Sugar fermenting and converted into gas expands to about forty bulks, which would explode any skin, and does explode the theory. It was put in new skins that it might not be contaminated and set to working by the old wine sticking to the skins; but chiefly to exclude the air, and so prevent its fermenting.

The caviling Jews called Jesus a "man, gluttonous and a wine-bibber," because He came "eating and drinking." He did not live like John Baptist, and they hated Him for that. Their statement that He was a wine-bibber does not prove that He drank intoxicating wines. They said He had a devil, but that did not prove it. The very charge indicates that then, as now, it was an objectionable thing for a teacher of religion to drink wine. It was a term of reproach. The unfermented wine that constituted the common drink of the people with whom Jesus lived, answers all the demands of this case.

The sacrament of the Lord's supper is rescued by the simple fact that this was the feast of the Passover which Jesus set apart as His memorial, and that the Jews ate nothing that had yeast or ferment in it at this feast. They were forbidden to offer anything that had leaven or yeast in it to the Lord. There is no indication that Jesus sent out and procured intoxicating wine when He had a supply of unfermented wine. Jesus even called it "*the fruit of the vine*," not the fruit of decomposition and fermentation.

God promised that His Holy One should not see corruption. God said to the sacrificing Jew: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven." Jesus gave the wine as His blood of the New Testament. It is not reasonable that He sought out a forbidden element for the purpose of exposing His sacrament to perpetual criticism. It is enough that Jesus called it "the fruit of the vine;" called in Deuteronomy "the pure blood of the grape."

The Corinthians made a drunken revel of this sacrament, and Paul rebukes them. He denounces the cup that intoxicated them as the cup of devils, while the appointed means he calls "the cup of

blessing" "the cup of the Lord," "the fruit of the vine."

The new wine of Pentecost is urged as an evidence that the sweet wine, or new wine, would intoxicate. The mocking Jews said, "These men are drunk on new wine." This was a stroke of supreme irony. Peter met it on that ground. He did not appeal to their character, but said: "We are not drunk; it is too early in the day." Even fermented wine would not intoxicate by that hour. Peter did not deny that he and his associates drank to excess any more than he denied that they drank at all.

The term used by the revilers—*gleukos*, the unfermented wine—prevented a full denial. They did drink that. The charge was adroit and insulting. It prevented denial, and involved that these men were so weak that they could be intoxicated even on sweet or unfermented wine.

It is also possible that the sweet wine, needing considerable care to prevent fermentation, might be carelessly treated like modern cider, and be able, in some stages of its transition, to produce the evil effects of intoxication while retaining its first name. This might make room for the charge and not prove that all *gleukos* (new wine) was intoxicating. The evidence is overwhelming to the contrary.

This apostolic "wine for *the stomach*" sake has been urged in this contest without stint. But there are a few facts that must be considered in interpreting this passage.

We are told by Pliny, Columella, and Philo that many of their wines produced headache, dropsy, madness, and *stomach complaints*. We are also told by Athenians that the sweet Lesbian is very good for stomach diseases. The sweet wines of Syria are now

used for dyspepsia and other stomach troubles. Can there be much doubt as to which Paul recommended?

Even if Paul prescribed fermented wine—of which there is not the slightest evidence—it must not be forgotten, (1) that it was ordered as a medicine; (2) that water was forbidden by the same authority; (3) that Timothy was so much of a teetotaler, that, even when sick, it required a Divine and apostolical command to induce him to touch it.

A deacon is required to have certain qualifications: one is, "not given to much wine;" literally, "not near much wine." A strict rendering of the passage makes it a total abstinence order. Even on our English and familiar rendering, it can be fully met by the theory of unfermented wines. It was often taken to the excess of gluttony. Men and women drank it for its pleasant taste, and drank to excess. Arts of administering emetics to prepare the subject for more of their sweet wine were often practiced by both men and women. Even short of that, an injunction not to drink to excess was safe. A literal rendering of the passage makes it a total abstinence command. The term favors unfermented as much as fermented wine. The distinction between Divine favor for one and Divine wrath against the other leaves little doubt as to which kind of wine is intended.

Brothers, time forbids my extending this argument. It is difficult to see why Christians should desire to load down the Bible with the evils of intemperance, and it is impossible to find a conviction against Jesus on the charge of being a drinker of intoxicating liquors.

The unfermented wine is lifted by the Saviour into

a symbol of His atoning work, and made a sacrament for His people forever. While fermented wine is left under the curse of God as a mocker and deceiver, full of all stings and fangs, giving only sorrow in this life and despair in the life to come.

"Wine is a mocker," and our wines contain all the deceit that ever characterized those drinks in any age. They are sometimes presented as a substitute for the stronger drinks, and so defended by many good men as the best means of aiding and securing temperance results. The facts of experience are too many and too clear to be mistaken. The countries that raise wine and have it as a common beverage are not noted for their sobriety. Allow me to present a little evidence on this point.

There is an impression that France is a temperate nation. Men ride through the country in the better class of cars and see little of it, because the matchless police remove the nuisance; but let them live there, and live with the people, and they will change their minds. Listen to the witnesses: Our author, J. Fennimore Cooper, says: "I came to Europe under the impression that there was more drunkenness among us (Americans) than in any other country. A residence of six months in Paris changed my views entirely. I have taken unbelievers about Paris, and always convinced them in one walk. I have been more struck by drunkenness in the streets of Paris than in those of London." Horace Greeley wrote from Paris: "That wine *will* intoxicate, *does* intoxicate; that there are confirmed drunkards in Paris and throughout France is notorious and undeniable." M. LeClere says: "Laborers leave their work, derange their means, drink irregularly, and transform into drunken debauch the time which should have been

spent in profitable labor." A French magazine says: "Drunkenness is the beginning and end of life in the great French industrial centers. At Lille twenty-five per cent. of the men, and twelve per cent. of the women, are confirmed drunkards."

The Count de Montalembert, member of the Academy of National Sciences, said in the National Assembly of France: "Where there is a wine-shop, there are the elements of disease, and the frightful source of all that is at enmity with the interests of the workman." M. Jules Simon: "Women rival the men in drunkenness. At Lille, at Rouen, there are some so saturated with it that their infants refuse to take the breast of a sober woman." Hon. James M. Usher, Chief Commissioner of Massachusetts to the World's Exposition in Paris, in 1867, says: "The drinking habit runs through every phase of society. I have seen more people drunk here than I ever saw in Boston for the same length of time. They are the same class of people too." Hon. Caleb Foote, of Salem, Mass., writing from Paris, after large investigations, denies, *in toto*, the theory that the people of the wine-producing countries are sober. Dr. E. N. Kirk, of Boston, says: "I never saw such systematic drunkenness as I saw in France during a residence of sixteen months. The French go about it as a business. I never saw so many women drunk." Surely there is no lack of testimony. Look at the other wine-growing countries.

Rev. E. S. Lacy, of San Francisco, six months in Switzerland, in a wine-growing section, says: "Here more intoxication was obvious than in any other place it was ever my lot to live in." Before the Legislative License Committee of Massachusetts, Dr. Warren, of the Boston Biblical School, seven years a

resident in Germany, says: "Drunkenness is very common; every evening drunken people stagger by my house." Rev. J. G. Cochran, missionary to Persia, says of a wine-producing section: "The whole village of male adults will be habitually intoxicated for a month or six weeks." Rev. Mr. Larabee, another missionary to Persia, confirms the statement. Even priests coolly excuse their own irregularities by the plea of drunkenness.

Thirty-five or forty years ago England attempted to suppress drunkenness by licensing ale and beer, yet she consumes more alcohol per head now than then. The consumption of alcohol has increased in the last fifty years one hundred and seventy-five per cent.

Turn to America. How fares it in California? The experiment fails. A State convention of the friends of Temperance, in October, 1866, resolved against wine-growing. Conventions of Congregational ministers and lay delegates, the same month, reached the same result. They are fully convinced that the hope of Temperance, based on wine, is delusive. This case has been tried till the State exceeds, perhaps, all others in corruption. Commissioner Wells says: "California, with her cheap wines for temperance, in the year ending June 30, 1867, sold fourteen times per head as much alcoholic stuff as Maine did, and more than any other State."

Dr. Holland, who, it will be remembered, some time ago wrote a book recommending wine as a substitute for alcohol—which book is yet quoted as an authority by those who advocate this theory—has, since his late travels in the wine-growing countries of Europe, where he had an opportunity to extend his observations, declared that his former views were wrong,

and that wine-drinking is a great producer of drunkenness, and that if we wished America to become a nation of drunkards we should adopt wine as our beverage.

These are the facts concerning the wine-growing countries. The idea of a substitute of wine for alcohol in the interest of Temperance is absurd. I have protracted this part of the argument because the enemies of this law are seeking to have wine and beer excepted from the law. But do it, and you kill the law; and this is what they seek. Beware! If you make wine and beer abound, drunkenness will much more abound.

Against this evil plan we can only thunder the facts that the countries that manufacture and drink most wine, use most distilled liquors, and have the largest per cent. of beastly wife-beating, child-beating drunkenness. Husbands may tell their ragged and pleading wives that they can stop; they guess they know who drives. They can stop if they will; but the fact remains. The 100,000 drunkards that annually die were all moderate drinkers before they settled down into old tubs. They all tippled a little before they guzzled. There is no disguising the fact. Once drinking, there is no way out but to face about and let it alone, or go through into hell. When a pair of dice are thrown and nine hundred and ninety-nine times out of one thousand turn double sixes, you are bound to believe the dice loaded. This awful game of perdition turns up death 100,000 times a year. Are you willing to believe that any dose is safe? Will slow scuttling keep a ship afloat better than no scuttling? Brother, I wish I could show you the hell there is in this beginning of sorrows. You who tipple are the ones that need to be alarmed. What!

you would not have me wait till hell closes behind you? 'Tis not the worthless sot that desolates the land; it is the respectable drinker. This is where the evil is conceived and born. Devils, like angels, are born babies, and grow to maturity. They never leap full-grown into the world. Beware of the beginnings of evil. The devil I am afraid of is not the old devil with his horns and hoofs, not when he comes snorting and spitting out his fire; but it is the devil with the kid glove and colored mustache; it is that devil I fear more than anything else. We are told, and there seems to be some force in it on the surface, that this wine-drinking may be the cause, but is never the occasion of drunkenness; which, if I correctly understand the report, and it be a correct report, ought to mean this: That a man, by drinking wine, may become a drunkard, but by simply drinking a little moderately his example will not make other people drunkards. I think that is a fair interpretation of the statement. It involves the whole question of influence. Let me say that that man who falls down by your door, that is all oozing and filthy, that you can hardly look upon, who looks as if he came from the table described in the book of God as covered with filthiness, that man will not inspire your lad with the love of rum; but it is your gay friend who comes to your home, who rides in your carriage, whom you honor as your friend, and whom your son honors as his father's friend, who goes into the elegantly gilded bar-room and there drinks his fashionable glass in the presence of the lad. That is the peril. I submit that if that proposition is true, then it is not true, as I understand that statement, that this moderate drinking may not be the occasion of intoxication. Wines can never advance

the Temperance cause by being substituted for distilled liquors.

"Wine is a mocker," and a deceiver. The infinite distance between the statements on the labels and the contents of the packages is only surpassed by the distance of the souls of the traffickers from God. The natural results and legitimate fruits of alcoholic wines are sufficiently appalling to amaze the very depths of perdition, but the worst remains to be told. *The deadly adulterations* are too fearful for description:

The chief poisons used are strychnine, stramonium, belladonna, and opium. These do the work. One bushel of the best corn will only make three gallons of whisky. But a little strychnine easily raises the average to four. Twenty-five per cent. of pure alcoholic strength is strychnine—three or four cents' worth adds this extra gallon. One drug-house in London sold in 1867 more strychnine to one liquor-house than all the city could use medicinally. Stramonium is made from the Jamestown weed. It is very common. It may cramp the stomach. This is corrected by opium. The taste of that is killed by potash. It produces dizziness, dimness of vision, and delirium. Belladonna is deadly nightshade—is all poisonous, roots, leaves, stalk, and all. Its symptoms are intoxication, violent gestures, laughter, followed by stupidity. It is cheap, only two cents per gallon. Now mark the progress in evil. A distiller adds one-fourth by strychnine. That strychnine gallon is sold to a wholesaler. He makes two of it by adding three cents' worth of stramonium and opium. The retailer doubles it into four gallons by adding belladonna. This decoction sells for ten cents a glass. And this is the practice all over the land! Dr. Cox,

the celebrated chemist, was appointed Inspector for Cincinnati by the Legislature of Ohio in 1855, and in two years' inspection he found more than ninety-nine per cent. of the liquors adulterated by the vilest poisons.

Let me enumerate some of the stuffs used everywhere. Receipts for counterfeiting are in common use among manufacturers and wholesale men. They are well known to the trade.

Here are some ingredients for giving the right heat and fire to the liquors: Pepper, capsicum, cloves, ginger, spice, vinegar, acetic acid, tartaric acid, citric acid, butyric acid, cream of tartar, nitric acid or aqua-fortis, sulphuric acid, prussic acid, sulphuric ether, nitric ether, spirits of niter, oil of vitriol, oil of turpentine, extract of Japonica, juniper berries, aloes, cochineal, black ants, and Spanish juice.

Here are some of the ingredients used to give taste and astringency: Bruised raisins, orange peel, coriander seed, white oak bark, tannic acid, kino, rhatany, catechu, wormwood, alum, copperas, sulphate of iron, and sulphate of copper.

Unnatural tastes are corrected by lime water, caustic potash, sugar of lead, and litharge.

The right or desired color is secured by using burnt sugar, beet juice, treacle, red-saunderswood, logwood, and sulphuric acid.* This is the stuff you are taking when you venture to "take a dram."

Only 30,000 barrels of wine are produced on the island of Madeira. We buy 50,000 here, and all the rest of the world has enough besides. There must be some fraud. Take port wine as another illustration. A little creek in Portugal waters the Douro Valley,

* These are parts of lists given by Dr. Charles A. Story.

only sixty miles long. Yet all the world drinks the juice from that bunch of grapes. London alone drinks twice as much as is produced, both good and bad. There is sold and consumed at least one hundred times as much as is produced. Follow a gallon of the real juice from the press on the banks of the Douro to the warehouse in Oporto. By the aid of beet-whisky, elderberry-juice, and water, it is made into five. In the London Dock warehouse it grows into ten by the addition of potato whisky, red-saunders, and other drugs. In New York it takes a dose of strychnine or belladonna, whisky, opium, and logwood, when it swells up into twenty gallons. In a wholesale house there it grows to forty gallons by the help of whisky, stramonium, red-saunders, logwood, and sulphuric acid. Then the retailer doubles it into eighty by adding tobacco-juice, water, burnt sugar, aloes, and sugar of lead. These are simple facts. Now, tell me, do you wish to run the gauntlet of all this infamous line of drugs and poisons? Talk about pure liquor! I fear the last man that has seen a drop of it is in his grave.

Brothers, I can not hold my peace in the presence of this all-desolating plague of intemperance. There is no safety anywhere with this evil stalking abroad. I can not sit silently by and see this murderer released, and Jesus crucified. We have everything at stake. This is the enemy of mankind. I will join hands with anybody against this enemy. By some means, by all means, we must subdue him. If once we can drive him back "to his own place," we can speedily redeem this world.

When I look down the past and see what a pilgrimage we have made—how we started but yesterday with nothing but empty hands and restless brain,

without tools, without weapons, without experience, without knowledge, and single-handed; have subdued the whole earth, have filled the world with inventions and arts and books and civilizations, and all this from nothing, and all this in the childhood of the race; *then*, when I turn toward the future, and the ages are rolled together before me, and I catch the songs of the coming nations, and hear the hum of the untold millions that, delivered from the dominion of sin, and served by all the laws and forces of the universe, and walking in the light of the Sun of Righteousness, shall cover these continents with cities, and make the great earth glad with holy triumphs—then I feel a new inspiration to toil on in this great cause of God. Surely, this monster must be cast out of the earth to make room for that city which is coming down from God out of heaven. In this our day of opportunity let every man be in his place!